DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 180 CE 035 037

AUTHOR Swanson, Gordon I.
TITLE Policy Studies in Vocational Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Div. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Cooperation; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Federal Aid; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; Financial Needs; Financial Support; *Government Role; *Government School Relationship; Literature Reviews; Program Effectiveness; *Public Policy; Secondary Education; Trend Analysis; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A project was undertaken to develop a concise restatement and rationale for the basis of a federal role in vocational education and to provide the back-up data supporting the cooperative relationship between the federal role and the subsidiary roles in vocational education. The project's activities were achieved by the work of an eight-member study team that developed a final report concerning the basis for a federal investment in vocational education. Delivered along with the report was a 10-page annex that summarized recent literature on the topic of federal involvement in vocational education. The success of the project is evident from the fact that the project report was in use even before it emerged in its final form. The report has already been utilized to elaborate the federal role in vocational education, to provide a basis for omitting vocational education from the Vocational Education Consolidation Act, and to establish a rationale for reauthorizing legislation. (Author/MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226180

Final Report

Project No. 7-R-79

Policy Studies in Vocational Education

Research and Development Project
in Career Education
Vocational

Conducted Using Funds Provided by the
Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Minnesota Department of Education
Under Subpart 3, Program Improvement and
Supportive Services, P.L. 94-482

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract from the Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Minnesota Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Division sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated, therefore, do not necessarily represent official Division position or policy.

Gordon I. Swanson, Project Director
Department of Vocational-Technical Education
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

October, 1982

CE 035037

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W Stock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

	Page
Cover Page	i
Title Page	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Abstract	iv
Body of Report	
Problem Area	1
Goals and Objectives	1
General Project Design and Procedures	1
Results and Accomplishments	2
Evaluation of Project	2
Project Impact	2
Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations	3
Annexes	
A - Final Project Manuscript	1-20
B - A Synthesis of Recent Literature	1-10

ABSTRACT
FINAL REPORT

Minnesota State Department of Education

Submitted by: Research Coordinating Unit For Vocational Education

DIVISION OF
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Check One:

☐ Approved Contract..... State Contract No.: 7-R-79

☐ In-House..... State Project No. : _____

Project Title: Policy Studies in Vocational Education

Principal Investigator and Organization: Dr. Gordon I. Swanson, University of MN, St. Paul, MN 55108
(Include City)

Telephone No.: (612) 373-5183

Funding Period: 5-1-79 (From) 6-30-1980 (To)

X Sec. 131: $ 6,199.53 Charged to Fiscal Year 1979 & 1980

___ Sec. 132: $ _____ Charged to Fiscal Year _____

___ Sec. 133: $ _____ Charged to Fiscal Year _____

___ Other: _____ (Source) _____ (Amount) Charged to Fiscal Year _____

OBJECTIVES:

1. To develop a concise restatement and reason for the basis of a federal role in vocational education and,

2. To provide the back-up data for the rationale leading to the cooperative relationship between the federal role and the subsidiary roles in vocational education.

PROCEDURES: The project's objectives were achieved by the work of an eight-member study team which met four times and developed a final report of no more than 20 pages which formed a part of an overall national inquiry involving six other study teams and a coordinating effort by the American Vocational Association.

PRODUCT(S) TO BE DELIVERED: The product delivered was a 20 page report endorsed by the study team and a 10 page annex which summarized recent literature on the topic.

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTION OR POTENTIAL IMPACT ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION:
The report of the project was in use even before it emerged in final form to (a) elaborate the federal role in vocational education, (b) provide a basis for omitting vocational education for the Education Consolidation Act and (c) to establish a rationale for reauthorizing legislation.

Policy Studies in Vocational Education

(An Inquiry into the Basis for a Federal Investment in Vocational Education)

Problem Area

The study was one aspect of a larger inquiry, national in scope, addressing policy and direction for vocational education in the next decade. The overall inquiry involved seven study teams coordinated nationally and of which this was only one part.

The problem involved the need to renew and to rethink a rationale for a federal involvement in vocational education and to ascertain the nature and balance of the involvement at various levels.

Goals and Objectives

The purpose of the project and the work of its study team was:

1. To develop a concise restatement and reason for the basis of a federal investment in vocational education and,
2. To provide the back-up data for the rationale leading to the cooperative relationship between the federal role and the subsidiary roles in vocational education.

Further, it was the goal of the activity to ensure that the results were action-oriented and actionable. Vocational education was addressed as an aspect of human resource policy, as an avenue for maximizing options and as a public trust in need of succinct policy statements available for public view and debate.

General Project Design and Procedures

The project was implemented as planned by the work of a study team whose efforts were coordinated with six other study teams. The study team met four times and the study team leaders met six times. Each involved a review of an evolving study team draft report and a review of the overall effort of all seven teams.

The specific study team identified with this project (8 members) was required to produce a report not to exceed 20 typewritten pages with a focus upon the following topics:

(a) A review of the basis for a federal role and federal-state relationships as reflected in current and past legislation.

(b) Development of a rationale for linking the present and potential programs of vocational education with explicit or implicit national goals, problems and concerns.

(c) Identifying the major issues surrounding the basis for a federal role and federal-state cooperation.

(d) Developing alternative courses of action appropriate to the issues.

(e) Identifying the short and long range consequences of the implementation of different policy alternatives.

(f) Developing a set of recommendations for federal support which derive from a consideration of issues, alternatives and consequences.

Results and Accomplishments

The Study Team implemented the project by producing a Report (attached as Annex A) entitled The Basis for a Federal Investment in Vocational Education. Also produced by the project was a synthesis of recent literature on the topic of the main report (attached as Annex B).

Evaluation of the Project

The evaluation of the project occurred as intended by the extent of use made of the rport, in full or in part, to identify direction and to influence thinking about policy. A second way of looking at the evaluation of the project is to ascertain the use of the report in the overall endeavor of the work of all seven study teams. The test, therefore, was one of use and effect.

Project Impact

Collectively as a part of an overall effort and separately, as an independent effort, the report of the project was used in publications, in Congressional staff activities, and in numerous presentations. The impact was the consequence, therefore, of its quality and its intended purposes.

In the light of the Rules and Regulations of P.L. 94-482, the project measured to the impact requirements of both sections 107.704 and 107.707. The project was instrumental in assuring that vocational education was not included in the Education Consolidation Act of 1981, thus assuring that the nature of vocational instruction in numerous learning situations would be influenced in all or most settings. Moreover, the activity initiated by this project continues in many states with a further or continuing elaboration of the roles involved in governance by different governing entities in their relationship to mission, planning, employment and economic development.

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

The conclusions and recommendations of the project emerged as:

(a) Seven essential goals where a federal investment is required (See P. 16, Annex A)

(b) Three instrumental goals where federal cooperation is needed (See P. 16, Annex A)

(c) Four functions of vocational education requiring a federal role in a cooperative relationship (see P. 17, Annex A)

(d) Ten admonishments specifying what federal legislation should not do (See P. 17, Annex A)

(e) Five unresolved issues requiring immediate as well as continuing attention (see P. 19, Annex A).

Annexes

A - Final Report - The Basis for a Federal Investment in Vocational Education

B - A Synthesis of Recent Literature (on the role of the Federal Government in the delivery of vocational education

THE BASIS FOR A FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

This report attempts to capture the line-of-reasoning as well as the central themes addressed by an American Vocational Association Task Force on the Basis for a Federal Investment in Vocational Education, to provide the public and the profession with a basis for thinking about the importance of the federal role in vocational education as a prior step to the reauthorization of federal vocational education legislation.

A Brief History

This brief look at history is offered to merely acknowledge the obvious--that trend lines exist and that it is instructive to examine them. Moreover, if the past is the incubator of the present and if the present is the incubator of the future, one is well advised to be familiar with the influence of the incubators. Recorded history, like memory, is also selective and, thus, incomplete. But even a brief and incomplete history of the federal role in vocational education is worth examining. It helps citizens decide whether they should see themselves as the creators or as captives of the forces which determine the federal role.

This brief examination of history will look at only three of the trend lines involving the federal role in vocational education.* It will examine the question of whether federal legislation has exercised a reforming or a refining function with respect to the status quo. Second, it will examine trends in the disjunctures which have developed between federal and subsidiary goals. Finaly, it will examine trends in implementing federal legislation.

*A more complete examination of the litureature addressing the federal role is attached to this report as Annex I.

The Federal Role--Reforming or Refining

All vocational legislation has been social legislation; there have been no exceptions. The variations have been in the focus and in the intensity of the social change. Moreover, the legislation which has been reform-oriented, rather than the laws which merely refined the status quo, has been more effective in improving the climate for subsequent improvements as well as instructional programs themselves. The most striking examples of reform legislation were thos enacted by Congress in 1862, 1917 and 1968. Before going further to describe the nature of each reform it is important to observe that the scope and intensity of reform in vocational education during the past century has diminished steadily from major reform in the early years to mere nibbling around the edges of potentially major reform in the later years. In Congress as well as in the profession the courage to address reform has diminished.

There are several possible explanations for the decline. When little or nothing exists it may be easier to affect reforms while in subsequent years it is often necessary to build on the foundations, strong or weak, established in earlier years. It is also realistic to conclude that Congress does more than respond to constituencies; it also creates them. They are created by legislatively identifying educational methodologies, administrative procedures, specific groups or structures and, in general, focusing on means rather than on ends. The constituencies thus created can be depended on to seek refinements which will elevate their presence in present formats rather than in reforms which may jeopardize their presence.

The Morrill Act of 1862 was a major reform. It was based on the intent that the nation should not enter the industrial age and continue to rely on a higher education structure which was elitiest, academic and limited. It included a new client system (sons and daughters of farmers and mechanics)

and a guarantee of geographic distribution. It was the prime mover in creating professional schools (law, medicine, engineering, agriculture, etc.), thus exposing more of the occupational ladder to higher education. It spawned the creation of graduate schools and, in general, it legitimized an expanding scope of higher education for the masses. Although the reform remains incomplete and unfinished, it was the Nation's most dramatic and most effective exercise in generating an institutional capacity to develop human resources. The federal role was permissive and facilitating; it was not prescriptive.

The Smith-Hughes Law (1917) provided an emphasis within secondary education which was parallel to the emphasis which the Morrill Act provided to higher education. It was based on the intent that (1) the nation should no longer rely on an academic, pre-college oriented system of secondary education to prepare its work force and (2) that it was important to see whether local and state governments would be willing to invest their own tax revenues in such programs. The first part of the reform has been a failure. Maybe it was an unrealistic hope in the first place. Such a change requires complete reassessment of the relationship betwen a nation's school system and its occupational structure. Also it may have been unrealistic to expect that State Boards of Education, created to deal with general elementary and secondary education, were adequate to deal with a reform of such magnitude. Most State Boards addressed it as if it were a necessary inconvenience to be accommodated within the routines and regulations of elementary and secondary education, rather than as a special set of problems and opportunities. The failure, however, is clear. The United States is the only large industrialized country in the world which continues to rely on a general or academic education as the only preparation for most of its entrants into the work force.

The second part of the reform, the test of the willingness of local and state governments to invest their own tax receipts in vocational education, has been a remarkable success. But much of the success has been at the local rather than at state levels. The commitment of locally generated resources to vocational education has consistently overmatched state allocations as well as federal appropriations. It has been insufficient, however, to realize the intent of the reform. The rapid growth and preemption of taxing power by state and federal governments have left local school districts with the dilemma of trying to expand local options in the face of a shirnking resource base.

The Vocational Education Act of 1968 was reforming, rather than refining, but it must be regarded as a minor reform. Programmatically, it gave federal legitimacy to much which was already underway. Its opening of governance and its expansion of programs to new clients must be regarded, however, as genuinely reforming.

What are some obvious conclusions about the federal role in vocational education? It is obvious that there has been:

1. A decline in the scope as well as impact of federal reform legislation intended to influence the relationship between the nation's educational system and its work force, and
2. An interesting parallel between the congressional intent to reform the higher education structure in 1862 (amended in 1890, 1907, and 1935) and the intent to reform the secondary education structure in 1917 (amended frequently thereafter). But there has been no effort by Congress to interace the university reform with the secondary education reform.

Disjunctures in Goals--Federal versus State and Local

The mismatch in the goal structure of vocational education which differentiates local goals on one hand, and federal goals on the other, has established its own trend line. It could have been expected that this mismatch would occur. The federal levies have covered a declining proportion of the costs and a rising proportion of the program requirements. Many of the local program requirements are responses to federally, or at least remotely, estimated needs. The indirect costs of federally legislated evaluation, for example, are borne almost entirely by the local level but are for purposes which do not directly serve the local level.

The relationships between federal and subsidiary levels are increasingly adversarial. The trend line is one of a widening gap between the goals seen at the various levels. The stated purpose of federal legislation, "to assist the states" has become an increasingly inaccurate description of the transaction. The direction of the assistance has become increasingly toward, rather than from, the federal level.

Trends in the Implementation of Federal Legislation

The trend lines describing the implementation of federal legislation have become increasingly clear. After early fears of domination by academic interests had subsided, vocational legislation was implemented to insure that it was flexible, facilitating and catalytic. More recent legislation has required implementation which results in it being prescriptive, limiting and inflexible. As one examines the federal vocational education legislation from the 1940's to the 1970's one observes:

1. A shift of emphasis from ends to means,
2. A rapid growth in control-oriented definitions,
3. A rapid expansion of federally legislated educational methodology,

4. Increased regidity in the formula-orientation of funding patterns and
5. The demand for documentation of compliance, which caused a need for a rapid growth in vocational education's administrative structure.

Summary

The most useful and acceptable federal vocational legislation has been the type which launched major system-wide reforms. The usefulness or utility may not have been associated, however, with only the scope of the reform, it may have been associated with its style of implementation at the federal level. The most durable reforms have sought a decentralized investment of creative initiative as well as funds. They have also occurred with a minimum of mismatch between federal and local goals and also a minimum amount of prescribed format or methodology. There has been a relationship of cooperation as well as assistance among levels of government. Questions of compliance did not begin with the premise that local institutions or agencies of government were enemies of the people. An adversarial relationship did not emerge, therefore, from the major reform-oriented legislation in vocational education in the early years.

Premises and/or Assumptions

A study of the goals of vocational education cannot be separated from its social, economic and humanizing functions. These functions do not reside at any one level of government--local, state or federal. To the degree that vocational education is an instrument of national purpose, such functions are within the domain of the federal interest.

Whether accepted implicitly or defined explicitly, there are certain assumptions which are accepted by the public and are, therefore, an accepted component of the public's expectation. A number of them are of

sufficient importance to warrant special mention. Included are the following:

1. The Need for a Rethinking of the Federal Role

At this state of its development, the rapid decline of homogeneity in vocational education, of functions as well as in clientele, would certainly have led to confusion even if there were no question about appropriate approaches to governance. The rising school-leaving age, the absence of military conscription or any form of national youth service, the popular demand for vocational preparation at all levels of education, and the growing reliance on vocational education as an instrument for resolving social conflict--all of these have prompted a sense of urgency about the appropriate roles at all levels--local, state and federal.

A central function of education in America is vocational. in an industrial democracy no function could be more legitimate. Nor could any function be more heavily burdened with ideology, multiple expectations and competing claims. All of these prompt a need for rethinking the dimensions of the federal role.

2. The Human Resource Framework

There is an implicit assumption, or at least a conjectural hope, that the nation has a human resource policy having as its central feature a concern for people in relation to work. Perceived in the most redimentary fashion, it has at least two dimensions. The first includes programs designed to improve each individual's ability to prepare for, adapt to and advance in

work roles in relation to their personal goals and to the opportunities for employment. The second dimension, an obligation of society or the community, is to improve the nation's ability to utilize the growingly diversified array of individual capabilities, to provide opportunities for individual self-support and fullfillment through employment, to assist in creating environments which enhance worker productivity and job satisfaction, to stimulate job creation and to facilitate worker mobility.

The two dimensions are not independent. Nor can they be separated from other policies, especially those related to education, fiscal management, income maintenance, and employment.

The acceptance of the premise that such an overarching human resource policy exists may be merely an act of faith. Such faith is enhanced by looking at programs in retrospect; it is not as evident as one looks for guidelines to shape future programs. Yet some of its dimensions can be seen in many programs at all levels of government. To accept the premise that such a policy is explicit enough to offer guidance to a federal investment in vocational education may be an act of charity. It is not included in the stated purposes of vocational education at any level. Nor is there more than meager attention to the need to strengthen the Nation's institutional capacity to implement such a policy focus. Nevertheless, there is a vague expectation that some sort of human resource policy exists and that

the federal role in vocational education is, somehow, crucial to it.

3. Institutional Capacitation

American society is a society of institutions. Most importantly these consist of the family, the school and the institutions of organized religion. Included in discussions, more and more often, are the institution-like entities such as communities, employing organizations, and the entities of organized labor.

That these institutions operate in the public interest is taken for granted. Their roles are considered in policies which relate to taxation, welfare and in the guarantees afforded the uses of freedom. These institutions are accepted by citizens as the normative instruments of human resource development and the primary organizers of voluntary activity.

The effect of government action may be either to enhance or to diminish the capacity of this institutional structure to deal effectively with human resource development. It is assumed that the federal programs which are carried out to implement a real or ostensible human resource policy at the federal level will also increase, or at least not weaken, the capacity of these institutions. This assumption should not, perhaps, be taken for granted.

Other Assumptions or Premises

Among the recurring assumptions within discussions of vocational education are those related to interpretations of federalism. Specifically, they involve assumptions about the relationships among federal, state ans sub-state entities. Traditional interpretations of federalism

involved mainly, if not solely, the relationships between the federal government and state governments. With the emphasis on decategorization, decentralization and revenue-sharing in the late 1960's, the concept of federalism becan to take new forms as well as interpretations. Sub-state agencies and organizations began to forge direct linkages with the federal government.

The assumptions and premises surrounding this development are numerous. Most importantly, it has increased the scope of public expectations held of the federal government and, thus, it has significantly expanded the expectations of a federal role--including the federal role vocational education.

A Categorical View of the Federal Role

A categorical view of the federal role in vocational education assists in thinking about the purposes of vocational education as defined in federal law. It also assists in thinking about federal roles which are not easily specified as purposes but which are, nevertheless, essential in the national interest.

In general, there are five categories of role or function which are appropriately identified as within the aegis of federal responsibility. They are:

1. The Maintenance of Defense Capability

   The maintenance of a defense posture is clearly a federal responsibility. But a defense posture is not determined solely by the size or the deployment of the military establishment, it is also determined by the capacity and capability of the nation's (including the defense establishment's)

--its ability to respond to defense or other. emergencies. In all Western societies, the measure of defense capability has been a measure of the potential for expanding the flow of materiel and, as a precondition, the flow of technically trained personnel.

The guarantee that vocational training capabities do not deteriorate below the levels needed for a healthly defense posture is entirely the responsibility of the federal government.

2. The Achievement of National Goals Related to Employment

A vocational education-related federal role is clearly a key to the achievement of national goals related to the work force. These include such goals as employment, energy conservation, economic development and productivity. The interest of the federal government in these goals in unquestionable.

The relatedness of vocational education to these goals is not solely because they are federal goals. State governments are now encouraging investment of foreign capital and they are offering the incentives of the training capacities of their vocational education establishment. Productivity has become a regional issue in competitive interventions to influence foreign trade and the mobility of industry. Numerous Area Vocational-Technical Instititues have become involved in training foreign nationals, a local involvement in federal goals,e.g., the foreign policy agreements at the federal level for influencing

the flow of energy. They are difficult involvements. In the absence of an authorized responsibility to contribute to such a federal goal, local agencies have great ambivalence in allowing federal needs and goals to compete for scarce resources at the local level.

3. The Maintenance and Strengthening of Institutional Capacity

The institutional structure of a society is the key to the quality and the condition of the human resources of the society. It is the basic institutions of a society which frame the values of a society and initiate its goal-setting activities. They provide the avenues to individual opportunity and they monitor many of the guarantees of the uses of freedom.

The importance of the federal role in maintaining the strength of institutions is, in part, a consequence of the enormous power at the federal level for weakening institutions. The family as an institution can be weakened by welfare provisions or tax policies with negative effects on families. Schools may be weakened by imposing federal requirements which exhaust local resources for maintaining institutional strength.

Because of the federal power to weaken the basic institutions of the nation, the power to maintain and strengthen institutions must be regarded as an important federal role.

4. Unique Federal Responsibilities

There is a category of role and responsibility which accrues to the federal government because of (a) its importance to the public interest, because (b) state governments cannot be

expected to address it (e.g., balancing regional imbalances of opportunity) or (C) because state governments have consistently ignored, delayed or otherwise expressed an unwillingness to assume the responsibility. This category includes research and inquiry, leadership development, generation of new programs and/or clients, equality of opportunity, providing adequate facilities and equipment and providing resources for intra-curricular youth activities.

5. Worker Mobility

There is a category of federal responsibility involving the flow of workers and worker trainees across lines of state jurisdiction, particularly where the flow is responsive to federal policies or requirements or when it is responsive to the absence of implemented policies or requirements. This includes the flow of illegal immigrants, refugees or the flow of citizens from areas of low federal investment to areas of generous federal investment. Federal intervention which results in a flow of either labor or capital require a parallel responsibility to accept a federal role in the training or upgrading of workers.

Federal Functions and Goals

Drawing from these categories, the following is an enumerated list of federal functions and goals. The list is divided into three parts, the essential goals for which there is a specific requirement of an explicit federal responsibility, the instrumental goals for which a federal role provides the necessary assistance and finally, the functions of vocational education requiring a federal role as a cooperative relationship.

A. Essential Goals (Federal Investment Required)

1. To support and strengthen the relationship of education to work by encouraging states to accept their constitutional responsibility for vocational education through legislative enactments.
2. To foster the growth and strength of institutional capacity for developing human resources.
3. To increase the productivity of the work force.
4. To support vocational education as an instrument of full employment.
5. To provide support for leadership development, research, program development, and field initiated inquiry at the highest levels.
6. To guarantee the right to vocational preparation for participation and advancement in the work force.
7. To ensure the adequacy of a continuing, responsive, and qualified supply of labor with consideration to migration, immigration and the general quality of human resources.

B. Instrumental Goals (Federal Cooperation Needed)

8. To cooperate with states to ensure maximum access to programs of vocational education. Examples of courses of restricted access include:
    a. lack of geographic proximity
    b. age of student
    c. insufficient personal or family income
    d. general economic conditions or
    e. discrimination.

9. To enhance the quality of work life

10. To cooperate with states and local education agencies when situations arise requiring them to serve as instrumentalities of foreign policy or of international agreements.

C. Functions (Requiring a Federal Role in a Cooperative Relationship)

11. To offer individuals the opportunities to acquire remunerative skills for use both at home and on the job including, as necessary, compensatory training or support.

12. To assist persons in developing problem solving skills, - individually and collectively, with regard to work or employment.

13. To assist persons who have not mastered the basic literacy skills needed to make progress in the work force.

14. To prepare persons for subsequent vocational and technical education, regardless of the level of that instruction.

Some Things Which Federal Legislation Should Not Do

The listing which follows is not in any order of priority. Nor is there any elaboration except in cases where a rationale provides non-obvious clarification. As an aspect of the federal role, the Congress should not:

1. legislate curriculum content or emphasis.

2. Legislate educational methodology. The legislation of educational methodology introduces a dual disadvantage. First it gives excessive deemphasis to non-authorized or unlegislated educational methodology. Second, it is unduly restrictive for Congress to

assign the choice of educational methodology to itself.

3. Dilute state or local programs by mandating special services or programs without provisions for additional revenues to cover the added costs.
4. Legislate funding formulas which treat all states as if they were homogeneous with respect to the need for legislatively earmarked funds.
5. Diminish the effectiveness of representative government at local or state levels by legislating the creation of appointed governing bodies to intervene in or to supersede the functions of elected governing bodies.
6. Create advisory councils with mandated membership categories, within which the representatives from business, industry, labor, and agriculture constitute less than a majority of members.
7. Legislate the existence of definitions which:
    a. unnecessarily override the intent of state legislation
    b. compound program difficulty at state or local levels.
    c. offer different interpretations of the same thing in different federal laws (e.g., defition of "handicapped" in CETA and Vocational Education
8. Require coordination at state and local levels in an attempt to remedy lack of coordination at the federal level.
9. Prescribe credentialling or recredentialling standards for vocational education personnel.

10. Require a dual system of reporting for identical functions (e.g., in Veterans Administration certification for certificate programs requires a report of clock hours of instruction while for degree programs a report of credit hours is required.

Some Unresolved Issues

The unresolved issues identified by the Task Force did not emerge as areas of disagreement. Rather they emerged as agreement with the proposition that the state-of-knowledge, an important concern of the federal government, is very incomplete. Policy options will remain as discursive exercises until this state-of-knowledge is more complete. There is a serious lack of the kind of information which must be drawn from inquiry rather than from evaluation or from accountability reporting. This includes:

1. Longitudinal Studies

   While it is readily recognized that longitudinal studies contribute much to a base of knowledge, there are few, if any, to inform the system-wide problems of providing education and training to the nation. A careful tracking of students from the early elementary grades through a decade or more of experience in the work force has not been attempted.

   There are many problems which will remain undefined and many left unsolved until such inquiries are launched and well underway. For example, what is the relationship between home or family environment and success in education

or work? How does the educational system begin to "track" students in various curricula and what are the conditions leading to "tracking"?

To what extent are curricula instrumental in allocating or misallocating human resources? What is the relationship between the impact of curricula and training and/or employment behavior of students from families at various levels of socio-economic status? What is the role of peer groups in the durability of occupational choice? What is the nature and extent of drop-out patterns? How do individuals relate to various forms of larbor market information over long time spans?

Longitudinal studies designed to answer such questions are the sole source of many types of reliable information. They are an important unfilled need.

2. Inquiries into the Occupational Structure and its Relationship to the Education and Training System.

If we knew more about the relationships between the nation's education and training system and its occupational structure it would be highly instructive. The occupational structure is a hierarchical system which relflects socio-economic status, aspects of occupational tenure (job security), remuneration and many other features related to opportunity and satisfaction. The education and training system, often equally hierarchial, is the major allocator of human resources to the occupational structure. The interaction between the two hierarchies is, therefore, of great importance in gauging the effectiveness of any human resource policy. The interaction is relatively

uninformed by inquiry, even to the extent of understanding how the problems associated with these interactions are adequately defined.

3. Inquiries into the Relationship Between Length of Training and Subsequent Outcomes.

As a subset of the occupational structure relationships mentioned above, there is a special unresolved issue regarding the length of training and subsequent outcomes. Low status jobs at the lower end of the occupational structure usually require a short training time while higher status occupations at the top end of the structure take a longer training time. The desire for training efficiency (minimizing training time and assuring early placement) is more evident at the lower end of the occupational structure than at the upper end.

In a society which emphasizes preemployment training and deemphasizes post-employment training, it is not known how this reduces opportunity and, in fact, enhances frictional unemployment. Moreover, training time may contribute more to employability than most other aspects of training. It is a phenomenon which is relatively unexplored and about which explicit public policy is very indefinite.

4. Dealing With the Problem of Differentiating Policy from Program Goals at the Federal Level.

To the extent that policies exist at the federal level, they are implemented by establishing or modifying programs. Evaluation, however, ordinarily examines the immediate effects of programs rather than the longer term effects on

the policies which the programs are intended to implement. Legislatively authorized training programs, for example, are rarely evaluated to assess their effects on the behavior of the Nation's overall education and training system--its adequacy, capacity or its currency. Here, too, the state-of-knowledge is incomplete and unfinished.

5. Addressing an Issue Involving the Scale of the Education and Training Enterprise.

The scale of the entire enterprise (including vocational education, CETA and industry training) may be too meager to allow any expectation that it is sufficient to contribute more than minimally to the human resource needs of the Nation's work force. There are no standards for measuring adequacy or sufficiency. The national problems of productivity, employment and economic development may be related to the scale of the enterprise as well as to its organization, focus and its effectiveness.

A SYNTHESIS OF RECENT LITERATURE

Annex B

The degree to which the federal government should play a part in the delivery of vocational education has been a continuing point of discussion since the early history of vocational education. Questions have addressed the limits of the federal role, the nature of such a role, and the purpose of the role. These questions have prompted different answers according to the particular political and economic issues of the day in which the questions were debated. Defining the federal role for the 1980's will also be guided by some of the same influences.

Current Literature Regarding a Federal Role

A review of current literature which focused on the federal role in education generally indicated the following consensus points:

- the impact of a federal role in education generally has been positive;
- there will continue in the future to be a federal role in education;
- the delineation of roles for each level of government will continue to come into sharper focus in the 1980's; and
- the purposes for which federal investments have been utilized for education vary, but generally fall within the following categories;
  - (1) to facilitate or safeguard equal opportunity;
  - (2) to contribute to the nation's economic welfare;
  - (3) to contribute toward national security;
  - (4) to facilitate social or economic reform through education;
  - (5) to further or maintain the world balance of power, and
  - (6) to stimulate, encourage, lead, and maintain the interest of states in achieving the previously mentioned goals.

The following viewpoints from the current literature are representative, rather than exhaustive. Three kinds of literature examined for this review directed attention to: (1) the benefits of an active federal role in education; (2) concerns regarding a federal role; and (3) federal-state-local role differentiations.

Benefits of a Federal Role

Halperin[1] collected several essays that presented, altogether, a very positive proclamation of the positive effects produced by the role of the federal government in education. Primarily, he saw the federal role as a catalyst for positive change in the educational systems at the state and local levels. In addition to viewing the federal government in its "change agent" or "reforming" role, Halperin posited the idea that the federal government was in the best position to provide overall planning for programs that would have national impact. He presented a case for restructuring aid programs for the purpose of providing a more coordinated effort between all levels of government.

Bottoms[2] listed certain benefits that a federal investment in vocational education holds for both individuals and the society. These include the economic advantages accrued by an individual participating in vocational education as well as the economic benefits which competent and productive workers provide for the nation.

Concerns Regarding a Federal Role

A concern evident in the literature and discussed particularly well by Singletary[3] focused on the need for a national policy for education, rather than an episodic, piecemeal legislation. He desdribed the role relationships of the various educational agencies as ". . . a national concern, a state

responsibility, but a local function." Noting both the growing federal investment in education and the lack of consistent patterns or trends of federal involvement. Singletary had two main concerns: (1) a clear-cut policy should be formulated regarding the federal role, and (2) role distinctions between all levels of government should be defined

Boyer[4] also recently called for clarification of the federal, state, and local role differentiation as a major concern.

> " . . . it's time to clarify the federal, state and local roles in education and seek to understand just what a central agency should and should not do.
>
> Education in America is primarily a state and local function. Any move to "federalize" it must be vigorously opposed. At the same time, the federal government, does have an obligation to promote national goals. Certainly it should at least (1) help the schools when federal policy brings them a special challenge or obligation; (2) help the schools to move toward equal opportunity for education, to overcome economic and social barriers; (3) help exceptional and disadvantaged students; and (4) promote the excellence essential to our Nation's intellectual health."

Passell[5] offered the viewpoint that the federal investment has in effect prevented the states from being more innovative and creative in solving their own problems. He seems to think that the states in general have not acted to solve their own problems but have reacted to federal monies offered to help solve specific problems. They, therefore, have relinquished control to the federal regulations. He would prefer the federal government put pressure on the states to force them to be a strong third party rather than a mere distributor of federal funds. He also recommends tha states seek more aid from the private sector, making the latter a stronger fourth party.

The Council of Chief State School Officers[6] listed certain impediments to effective federal-state relationships in education. These include;

(1) a lack of inter-programmatic coordination;

(2) regulations established by federal agencies which exceed authority granted in the statutes;

(3) no logical purposes for gathering some information which is required for reporting;

(4) federal policies and regulations resulting in confusion and inefficient administrative practices;

(5) federal agencies bypassing state agencies in some programs and dealing with districts and institutions directly;

(6) audits which are often late and not consistent with rules and regulations;

(7) funding approval which is delayed by inefficient administrative practices; and

(8) federal policies prescribing methodology rather than outcomes.

Halperin[7] also noted some of the problems in the federal involvement in education:

> . . . perhaps the federal government is trying to do too much in the field of education. There is no clear federal priorities and the burden of federal regulations is excessive.
>
> . . . educational reform can only come from joint effort in the spirit of cooperation and partnership between federal, state and local entities. Therefore, the federal role must be clarified and focused. Every action should be a deliberate effort to strengthen the inter-governmental system.

Role Differentiation: Federal-State-Local Investments

In an informal colloquim at the Institute for Educational Leadership, the following perspectives were voiced:

Thomas Wolanin, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Labor-Management relations, U.S. House of Representatives suggested:

> . . . it would seem that the federal role is most appropriate in those kinds of policies where it is not in the interest of any given state or local jurisdiction to undertake the funding of something that will be shared so broadly beyond boundaries of the state that a federal role is required.

> . . . the federal role should encompass things you identify--innovation, research, and equal opportunity. 8

Chester Finn, Jr., Research Associate, Governmental Studies Program, Brookings Institution suggested three different approaches that the federal government could utilize:

> . . . aid to states to do what they would like to do in their systems;
>
> . . . the federal government as a resource to compensate for things the states can not or will not do; and
>
> . . . the federal government can try to change the system by providing leadership which will encourage the states to begin doing things differently if appropriate. 8

Michael Timpane, Director, Center for Educational Finance and Governance, Washington Office, Rand Corporation saw three purposes for the federal investment in education:

> . . . to provide equal opportunity;
>
> . . . to bring reform to educational practice; and
>
> . . . to fund research in education and research about education 8

Samuel Halperin, Institute for Educational Leadership, saw a pivotal role of the federal government as that of:

> . . . encouraging or strengthening educational leadership at all levels of the system. 8

Ellis[9] recently elaborated his view of what the current federal priorities are in relation to vocational education as follows:

> . . . direct money to under-served populations;
>
> . . . encourage planning at the local, state and national levels to produce more employable graduates; and
>
> . . . establish specific programs to employ and stimulate the employment of youths and adults.

From a recent monograph of federalism, several key authors addressed the problems of role differentiation in federal-state-local partnerships.[10] Also, Robert McBride[11] former President, National Association of State Boards of Education, spoke about the federal role in relation to its

regulatory responsibilities as follows:

> . . . the law must not be absolute and prescriptive in terms of how the program is to be carried out;
>
> . . . regulations should be designed to meet only the major problems, not every possible eventuality;
>
> . . . regulations should be written in English, not "federalize"; and
>
> . . . ombudsmen should carefully scrutinize all final regulations and challenge any sections not clearly required by law.

The Education Commission of the States[12] took the position that the responsibilities of the federal government should be to:

> . . . identify national goals and areas of critical needs in education;
>
> . . . provide substantial funding for education to the states in the form of general aid in order to make education services more nearly equal between and within states;
>
> . . . consolidate categorical aids into a few block grants consistent with areas of critical need;
>
> . . . complete the appropriations in time for effective planning by state and local agencies;
>
> . . . be the primary funding agency for research and development; and
>
> . . . develop and finance a system of educational data and information collection in cooperation with state and local education systems.

In the same monograph, John Pittenger, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urged educators to become involved in the emerging debate over the nature of the federal system in order to maintain a balance of power. He saw unique and positive roles for the federal government, particularly in facing major issues which are global in scope, and in mediating the distribution of shrinking resources. He saw certain characteristics as indicative of a federal role. These included:

> . . . federal efforts to strengthen rather than weaken the state efforts;
>
> . . . distribution of funds by allocation to states, then to districts, as a more equitable means of dispersement;
>
> . . . federal intervention in specific areas including the design of legislation to meet conditions created by action of federal courts; and
>
> . . . federal support to impact conditions that are uniquely national in scope and character.

In addition, Pittenger[13] analyzed the state function of helping the federal government to define their own roles as critical. He was adamant in pointing out what the federal government should not do:

> . . . it should not deal directly with local districts;
>
> . . . it should not legislate or regulate so that the governance, funding, or administrative procedures in the states are distorted or destroyed;
>
> . . . it should not overestimate its own power to deal with intractable problems; and
>
> . . . it should not overdo a good thing (e.g., the Buckley Amendment on the privacy of student records).

Historical Views of the Federal Role

In addition to the current literature, perhaps key writings from historical literature would provide a comparative base for examining the federal role over time. Greenwood[14] found that the early leaders viewed the federal role as an intervening role for providing more social and economic opportunity for those individuals whose probable destinies would not include baccalaureate degrees. In reviewing Charles A. Prosser's writings from 1900 to 1916, prior to the writing of the Smith-Hughes Act, the following concepts were identified:

. . . government intervention in public schools must be secured to protect the general welfare and preserve common justice;

. . . laws are a necessary means for reforming and improving the human condition;

. . . the school should foster useful knowledge (for work, citizenship and leisure);

. . . in a democratic society, the wage-earner should have the right to preparation for work at public expense;

. . . state and federal legislatures should intervene to see that wage-earners receive job preparation as part of their education;

. . . federal-state-local partnerships are the best means of providing vocational education;

. . . vocational education is a federal responsibility in that it will conserve and develop natural resources, prevent waste of human labor, increase wage-earning power, meet the increasing demand for trained workmen, offset the increased cost of living, and enhance national prosperity; and

. . . ..vocational education will decrease industrial and social unrest due to a lack of vocational training, and it will promise a better education which will result in higher standards of living for individuals.

In summary, the early leaders of vocational education, from 1900 to 1917, viewed the federal role as including three functions:

. . . to foster universal public schooling;

. . . to encourage equality of educational opportunity; and

. . . to serve as a guardian of opportunity (both economic and social.)

References

(1) Halperin, Samuel, Essays on Federal Education Policy, The George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C. January 1976

(2) Bottoms, Gene, "The Case for Investment in Vocational Education," Voc Ed, the Journal of the American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C., December, 1978, pp. 7-8.

(3) Singletary, H. Titus, Jr., "What is the Status of State-Federal Relationships in Schooling?" Educational Leadership, February 1978, pp. 374-379.

(4) Boyer, Ernest, (editorial) CCCSO Stateline Quarterly Newsletter, circa January, 1978.

(5) Passell, Peter, State Policies and Federal Programs, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1978, pp. 34-91.

(6) Council of Chief State School Officers, Impediments to Effective Federal-State Relations, Washington, D. C., March 6-8, 1977.

(7) Halperin, Samuel, Clarifying the Federal Role by Strengthening Intergovernmental Systems, Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., December 1976.

(8) Andringa, Robert, Fin, Chester E., Jr, Halprin, Samuel, Timpane, Michael, Wolanin, Thomas, Perspectives on Federal Educational Policy: An Informal Colloquim, George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, August, 1976.

(9) Ellis, John, Vocational Education and Federal Priorities, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, December 1978.

(10) Halperin, Samuel, and Kaplan, George R., Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policymaking, George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D. C., December 1976.

(11) McBride, Robert, "Federal-State Educational Relationships by the 1980's: Some Alternatives for Consideration," Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policymaking, Institute for

(12) Education Commission of the States, "Sorthing Out the Roles: Federal, State and Local Responsibilities in Education," Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policy-making, Ibid., pp. 57-58.

(13) Pittenger, John, "Achieving a Rational Balance: Some Realities of Federal-State Relations," Ibid., pp. 7-13.

(14) Greenwood, Katy Brown, A Philosophic Rationale for Vocational Education: Contributions of Charles A. Prosser and his Contemporaries from 1900 to 1917, (doctoral dissertation), University of Minnesota, 1978.